IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT CHARLESTON

_____x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Criminal Action

Plaintiff, : No. 2:14-CR-00276-1

:

v. : Date: February 4, 2016

MICHAEL E. BURDETTE, :

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD
BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: AUSA PHILIP H. WRIGHT

AUSA ERIC P. BACAJ

U.S. Attorney's Office

P.O. Box 1713

Charleston, WV 25326-1713

For the Defendant: SUSAN M. ROBINSON, ESQ.

Thomas Combs & Spann

P. O. Box 3824

Charleston, WV 25338-3824

Probation Officer: Matthew Lambert

Court Reporter: Ayme Cochran, RMR, CRR

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS had before The Honorable Thomas E. Johnston, Judge, United States District Court, Southern District of West Virginia, in Charleston, West Virginia, on February 4, 2016, at 2:35 p.m., as follows: COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: The matter before the Court is the United States of America versus Michael Burdette, criminal action number 2:14-cr-00276, scheduled for sentencing. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Will counsel please note their appearances? MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Philip Wright and Eric Bacaj on behalf of the United States. MS. ROBINSON: Susan Robinson on behalf of the defendant, Michael Burdette, who is present in court, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Mr. Burdette, will you please stand, and I will ask the deputy clerk to administer an oath to you at this time. COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Please raise your right hand. MICHAEL BURDETTE, DEFENDANT, SWORN THE COURT: You may be seated. Mr. Burdette, do you understand that you are now under oath and you must tell the truth and, if you testify falsely, you may face prosecution for perjury or for making a false statement? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may remain seated unless I indicate otherwise. You might just want to pull that microphone a little

1 closer to you there.

Throughout the course of this hearing, if there's anything that occurs that you don't understand, I want you to feel free to speak up and seek clarification.

Also, if at any time you need to confer with your attorney,

I'll be pleased to pause the proceedings to allow you to do so.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Robinson, have you received and read and reviewed with your client the most recent edition of the Presentence Report? The financial information was modified slightly here in the last day or so.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. We've received the Presentence Report, and both addendums, and I've reviewed both of them with my client.

THE COURT: All right. Very well.

Just so I'm clear, Mr. Lambert, the change you made in the defendant's financial calculation was basically a math change. The assets and liabilities remain the same, but the net worth calculation -- the net worth itself changed slightly; is that correct?

PROBATION OFFICER LAMBERT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Very well.

Mr. Burdette, have you received and read and reviewed with your counsel a copy of the most recent edition of the Presentence

```
1
        Report?
 2
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT: Has the Government received and reviewed a
        copy of the report?
 4
                  MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.
 5
                  THE COURT: All right. Ms. Robinson, do you have any
 6
 7
        live objections remaining?
 8
                  MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.
 9
                  THE COURT: All right. The ones that were asserted
10
        then, I will view then as either withdrawn or moot.
11
             The parties have responded with regard to the issue of
12
        sealing materials. I think the only real issue was the
        sentencing memo. Has that been changed now in the record? Has a
13
        new sentencing memo been filed?
14
15
                  MS. ROBINSON: Yes. A redacted version of the
16
        sentencing memorandum, as well as a redacted version of the
17
        letters that were sent to the Court on behalf of Mr. Burdette,
        have been filed as of yesterday and are public record.
18
19
                  THE COURT: And the medical records remain sealed?
20
                  MS. ROBINSON: Correct. And all other exhibits were
21
        unsealed following the Court's order.
22
                  THE COURT: All right. Very well.
23
             Are we all squared away on sealed documents in this case?
24
                  MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor.
                  THE COURT: As far as we know?
25
```

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Very well.

All right. Then, subject to the addenda -- oh, and, as I've indicated in prior hearings, I'm going to apply a plus-four for the discharge, instead of a plus-six. That is without prejudice to the Government arguing that point in subsequent defendants' hearings, but that's how I'm going to apply it today. So, I will ask the probation officer to prepare an addendum to the Presentence Report reflecting that. Subject to that, I will adopt the Presentence Report.

I would note that I did receive a sentencing memorandum from the defendant. That included several attachments with regard to -- I read the letters and they're already in the record. Those are attached, as well. They're already in the record, as redacted. I would note that there were several pages of medical records. I didn't read through all of those because it got pretty technical, but I did read the letter and I understand the general import of that information.

Also, I would note for the record that some materials were submitted from potential victims and were included in the docket -- on the docket of Mr. Reynold's sentencing hearing and case -- and, unless somebody sees some reason to do so, I don't intend to put them on the docket of this case. Is there any objection to that?

MR. WRIGHT: No, Your Honor.

MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And, while I'm thinking about it, Mr. Wright, so I don't do like I did in the last hearing and forget, I'll ask you now, have the -- with regard to any potential victims, have their rights and notifications been afforded to them under the victims rights statutes and regulations?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor. And, as I indicated in the hearing that we just concluded, but for the record in this case, I did receive a notification from a Maya Nye, who asked that the letters that she has previously submitted to the Court be read in open court so that the defendants could hear it, and I'm passing on that request. As far as I know, Ms. Nye is not in the courtroom and no one has notified me that they would like to speak to the Court.

THE COURT: Very well. And I will turn that request down. It's noted, but I will turn that request down for the reasons I've previously stated.

Thank you, Mr. Wright.

On March 18th, 2015, the defendant appeared before this Court and entered a plea of guilty to a single-count information charging him with negligent discharge of a pollutant in violation of 33 U. S. C. 1319(c)(1)(A) and 1311. I deferred a factual basis finding at that time.

The one thing I want to note for the record, and I mentioned

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this very topic in the Reynolds sentencing hearing and, Ms. Robinson, I note, was here for that proceeding, and that has to do with causation. The -- as I have read through these reports, I have learned that -- well, and I'll talk about this more later. This defendant, in particular, was seeking repairs to the dike wall, but I would note, and this is really, I think, the foundation of this -- to me, this is the foundation of this prosecution in this particular case, he went about that the wrong way. He should have followed the permit, should have put into place, or directed that -- or led the effort to put into place a Stormwater Protection Plan and a Groundwater -- I'm sorry, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and a Groundwater Protection Plan. Had that occurred, there would have been a number of things that would have been formalized and made a part of the workplace and the operation of the company, including inspections, training, a committee, all of which would likely have generated documentation.

The record indicates -- the Presentence Report indicates that this defendant requested at least some repairs to the dike wall and that never came about from higher-ups in management, but I believe that if those -- if the plans had been put into place, it would have, within the institution of the company, made a much stronger case, maybe an overwhelming case for the repairs to be made, especially given that if you're going to inspect this thing, it's going to create documents, and evidence, and I think

pressure to bring about these repairs.

I don't -- I think it's impossible, since none of this ever happened, to know for sure that it's inevitable that those repairs would have been made if this had been followed, but I think it would have been much more likely, and we know the result without the plans -- nothing happened, and this incident occurred. So, that is -- in recognition that this defendant did not have full control of the pursestrings; but, nonetheless, there's much he could have done to bring back -- to bring about the repairs that were necessary, and I think it is much more likely that would have occurred if this defendant had followed the permit and made sure that he did everything he could to put these plans in place and carry them out as far as he possibly could.

So, is there any -- those are the inferences I draw from all of this. Is there any objection to that, Ms. Robinson?

MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor, there's not. In fact, it's much like my analysis as I was considering the facts and evidence in this case and advising my client.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Burdette, do you agree with what I've said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Very well. Based on that then,
I will find a factual basis, and I will adjudge the defendant
guilty of the crime to which he has pled guilty, and will accept

the plea agreement that was previously filed.

Next, I note, Mr. Wright, that you have indicated that you intend to make a motion pursuant to 5K1.1. You have, as has been your custom in these cases, provided my chambers with a memorandum in support of such a motion, but have not filed it on the docket. I will first ask, is there any reason for us to hear that motion in-camera?

MR. WRIGHT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And is there any reason not to go ahead then and place that memorandum on the docket?

MR. WRIGHT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any objection to that?

MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That will be so ordered.

I have read that memorandum, Mr. Wright, but I will -- well, let me go ahead and do this. I will lay out the standard and then I'll let you make your motion and any comments that you have.

Pursuant to 5K1.1 of the sentencing guidelines, the Court may depart from the guidelines upon motion of the Government stating that the defendant has provided substantial assistance in the investigation and prosecution of another person.

In determining the appropriate reduction, the Court may consider the significance and usefulness of the defendant's assistance; the truthful, completeness, and reliability of any

information or testimony provided by the defendant; the nature and extent of the defendant's assistance; any injuries suffered or any danger or risk of injury to the defendant or his family resulting from his assistance; and the timeliness of the defendant's assistance.

Give me just a moment, please.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wright, I'll hear from you now.

MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, as so indicated in that memorandum, we do hereby file a motion pursuant to Section 5K1.1 of the sentencing guidelines to reflect the substantial assistance that Mr. Burdette provided. I won't go through every single one of those in detail, but I will say that his assistance was significant.

And, if it's not plainly stated in that memorandum, I will state that he was the most helpful cooperator that we had. He participated in a lengthy debriefing session, provided testimony, and made himself available on short notice to answer questions.

Significantly, he also provided us with records, his notes that he took that were more or less a daily log of his activities that provided us key insights, corroborated much of the information that he gave to us and, indeed, we would have attempted to introduce some of those notes as exhibits.

He was the second defendant to agree to cooperate and was,

thus, I would say, very helpful, almost critical to our remaining charges against the remaining defendants with the indictment that followed within a month and a half of his first agreeing to sign the plea agreement, and it is for those reasons, and the reasons that I have stated in the memo, that the United States recommends that the Court depart from the guideline offense level, which we believe is 12 months in this case, or sentence, the guideline sentence, to Level 8 in the sentencing guideline range.

THE COURT: All right. I will adopt -- well, Ms. Robinson, do you have anything to add?

MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will adopt the comments of the Government both in their written and oral presentation.

I would note that, in reading this file, it's obvious that the defendant is a note taker and took very detailed notes of what was happening on a regular basis, and I can imagine how helpful that was to the Government. That's not something that comes along every day in every case, and I can imagine that that would have been extremely helpful to understanding the case, and understanding what happened, and building the case as the prosecution went forward. So, I will grant the motion and depart down to a Level 8 as has -- as the Government has suggested in the motion.

I'm now ready to give my tentative findings as to the applicable guidelines.

1 First, Mr. Wright, is there a motion for the third level for 2 acceptance of responsibility? 3 MR. WRIGHT: There is, Your Honor. THE COURT: The motion will be granted. Therefore, I 4 find a Base Offense Level of VI; plus 4 for the discharge; plus 4 5 6 for the disruption of public utility; plus 4 for discharge in violation of permit, for an Adjusted Offense Level of 18, minus 3 7 8 for acceptance of responsibility, for a Total Offense Level of 15; a Criminal History Category of I based on O criminal history 9 10 points, otherwise yielding an imprisonment range of 18 to 24 months, but that is capped at 12 months because of the 11 12 statutory maximum and, therefore, that is the guideline range. Then, with regard -- after the application of the 5K 13 reduction, I find a Total Offense Level of 8, a Criminal History 14 15 Category of I, yielding an imprisonment range of 0 to 6 months, 16 which is in Zone A, which allows for straight probation; 1 to 17 5 years of probation; 1 year of supervised release, if imprisonment were imposed; and a fine range of \$2,500.00 to 18 19 \$100,000.00; and a mandatory special assessment of \$2,500 -- or 20 \$25.00. \$25.00, which I note has already been paid. 21 Is that correct, Ms. Robinson? 22 MS. ROBINSON: That is correct, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. And no restitution. 24 Is there any legal objections to my tentative findings as to the applicable guidelines? 25

MR. WRIGHT: No, Your Honor.

MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Burdette, at this time, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure give you the right to make any statement that you would like to make, although you're not obligated to make any statement. However, if you do choose to make a statement, I would ask that you stand to do so.

You may want to pull that up. Yeah, there you go.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor. I would first like to apologize to the citizens of West Virginia, to my family and friends, and to all those affected by the Freedom spill.

From the beginning of my employment with Freedom Industries, I tried to bring my experience with capital projects and maintenance programs to the corporation to help them maintain their facilities in a reliable manner. When I later took the position of the plant manager, I did not fully appreciate the environmental compliance and regulatory issues and I take responsibility for my role in not -- in failing to see that the company was in full compliance with those permits.

I was very excited when Freedom Industries was purchased by Roosevelt Mining, as the projects that I had on the books for years were finally going to be implemented, but everything changed on January the 9th of 2014, and my focus changed from future projects to working with various state and federal agencies and contractors through the bankruptcy CRO to ensure

that the remediation work and containment of site stormwater occurred in a safe and deliberate manner. I worked countless hours until July of 2014 to address the issues. I was born in South Charleston, West Virginia, and my family and friends live downstream of this event, and I did what I could do to help bring this event to a successful conclusion.

Thank you, Your Honor, for allowing me to speak before the Court, and the people of West Virginia, and my family and friends, as well.

I have learned some valuable life lessons at a significant personal cost and, while I do not know what the future holds, I know that I will never work for a company that does not put people, the environment, and the assets above profits. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may be seated.

Ms. Robinson, anything else to add on behalf of the defendant?

MS. ROBINSON: Your Honor, I know the Court has received letters from Mr. Burdette's colleagues, as well as his family members. I began representing him within a week or two of the Freedom spill and, over the last two years, I've come to find everything that's been said in those letters to the Court about Mike's character to be true. He's been unfailingly honest with me. He has demonstrated -- and, from everything I've learned, he has been a hard worker his entire life. He has been diligent.

He's earned the respect of everyone that he's worked with.

Unfortunately, he did accept a position without having clearly defined responsibilities with a company that wasn't -- you know, wasn't operated appropriately in compliance with the environmental laws, and he did so without full appreciation of his responsibility to comply with the environmental regulations and to ensure that the plant was in full compliance. I don't have any doubt in my mind that Mike, had he opened up the files, had he appreciated what his role was, that he would have done everything within his power to see that the plant was in compliance.

As it was, he, from his engineering background and from his standpoint of a responsible -- a responsible operator of a facility and a plant manager, did what he could to have repairs made where there could be repairs made within the financial ability and constraints that were imposed upon him by the company. This is not a crime that Mike committed for profit. He had no motive to save costs for the company. And none of his actions or inactions were governed by that type of motivation on his part.

As Mr. Wright has said, he has provided -- you know, since that time, he worked hard to help with the remediation project. He came in early, pled guilty to an information. He has provided Mr. Wright with the notes and records that he kept throughout his entire career that he continued to keep during Freedom and, you

know, those notes and records, if you read them, they will not show you an individual who is trying to hide activities or what was being done. He wrote down everything that was being done.

His crime was one of omission. It's a serious crime, and he recognizes that, but he's done what he can to help the Government. He has been instrumental. I mean, if you read the pleadings that the Government filed shortly after he came in, you could tell that the indictment was crafted a lot on what Mr. Burdette had to say.

He's been financially devastated by the spill. He does not have a job. He's not employed. Perhaps the stigma of even working for Freedom during this crisis will prevent him from obtaining employment in his field here in the State of West Virginia.

You know, his age, his health, all of those factors are factors that, you know, I hope the Court will fully take into consideration in imposing sentence, and I would ask that the Court, given his role, he's not an owner of this company. He didn't have a financial motive. He came in. He cooperated. He's done what he can do. Given his role, I would ask the Court to impose a minimum fine, due to his financial resources, as well as a minimum term of probation. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, Mr. Burdette is charged with and he has pled quilty to negligence. We have no evidence to

believe that he knowingly -- or any of the individual defendants knowingly and intentionally violated any environmental law. It was, nonetheless, an offense with great consequences, causing a significant public disruption. That gravity, the gravity of that offense, must, of course, be balanced against or by his cooperation and assistance which, as I indicated to the Court, was very, very significant; in fact, critical. So, weighing those factors, Your Honor, it is our position that a sentence imposed in accordance with the statute and pursuant to a Guideline Level 8 would be appropriate.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

I'm going to take a brief break to review my notes and I'll be back to impose sentence.

(Recess taken.)

THE COURT: All right. After consideration of the advisory guidelines and the other applicable factors under Section 3553(a), I am now ready to impose sentence.

Will the defendant please stand?

Mr. Burdette, to be sure, the "Water Crisis", as it has come to be known, was a traumatic event for the communities in the area whose water service was impacted. It was appalling to think that such a contamination of something so basic, yet essential as drinking water, could happen in this day and age with all the environmental regulation and awareness that now exists.

This event, now two years past, clearly had a disruptive

effect on people's lives and, perhaps worse yet, on their trust in the safety of the water coming from their taps.

But the crisis passed. We have no reason to believe that problems related to the Water Crisis linger in our taps, and I have no evidence before me that MCHM, while perhaps an immediate irritant, represents a long-term health threat to anyone.

As I've said before, I've struggled with the sentencing decision in these cases as much or more than I have in any other case. There are multiple facets of these cases that tend to pull the sentencing decisions in different directions.

While there's no doubt that causing a discharge of a pollutant chemical into the water supply is a serious, a very serious offense requiring a just punishment, I cannot ignore the fact that these charges for all the individual defendants, including you, are misdemeanors and not based upon intentional conduct but, at most, negligence -- carelessness, in layman's terms. This is a major consideration in these sentencing decisions, including yours.

We handle few misdemeanors in federal court. Of the hundreds of criminal cases over which I've presided in nearly ten years, I would guess that less than ten have been misdemeanors before now. Of those, I can only recall one, a political corruption case with no 5K motion, in which I gave prison time.

In the eyes of the legal system, a misdemeanor charge limits the seriousness of the crime and must necessarily limit the

punishment, as well. The federal sentencing guidelines recognize this distinction specifically in relation to these very crimes. The guideline calculation which governs these cases is based by the explicit terms of the guidelines themselves on knowing and, therefore, intentional misconduct.

If the evidence, the evidence, and charges against these defendants had reflected intentional misconduct, they would likely be facing relatively lengthy prison terms the guidelines would otherwise call for. However, since they're misdemeanors and not based on knowing conduct, the guidelines suggest a downward departure. The problem for me is they don't recommend how much of a departure should be considered. Thus, the guidelines are of little use in fashioning a sentence in this case.

It's likewise difficult to find information on prior sentencings in Clean Water Act and Refuse Act misdemeanor cases to use as a starting point for a sentencing decision; although, I will say, your counsel helpfully pointed out statistics from the United States Sentencing Commission which showed that nationwide, a large percentage of environmental cases get probation. These statistics make no distinction between felonies and misdemeanors, so they can be read to include both, which suggests the percentage of probation for misdemeanors would be even higher.

You're hardly a criminal. You have no criminal history and you've been a working engineer most of your life. You do not

possess -- you don't pose a further threat to the public and I find little need to deter you from further crime with this sentence.

Of course, deterrence of others is also a very important consideration. The threat not only of prosecution itself, but resulting damage to reputation, large bills from lawyers, and the anxiety of facing justice before a judge means that the fact of these prosecutions alone will likely have a significant deterrent effect. Potential polluters should take note of what happens even when you just turn a blind eye to environmental problems, not to mention polluting intentionally. Thus, the efforts of the Government and the investigative agencies in these cases have already created a deterrent to this sort of conduct.

Now, I do note your cooperation, which Mr. Wright has indicated was perhaps the most significant cooperation in the entire case. The -- I can't underscore the importance of sending a deterrent message to those who are involved in industries that handle chemicals like this that they need to follow the permits and they need to make sure that their facilities are safe, not only for their workers, but also for the environment.

Now, there are two major factors that make your case different from the other defendants. First of all, after considering and debating your role in this incident and in Freedom, I've concluded that you're probably the least culpable defendant of all. The Government may not agree with that, but

that's my determination.

There's no dispute that you tried to get the containment dike wall fixed and the higher-ups in the company wouldn't approve the dollars for it. The problem with that was you went about it the wrong way. You should have followed the permit and you should have ensured that the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Groundwater Pollution Plan were in place, that there were inspections, that there was some training, that there was a committee, and done all you could through that process to try to get — to try to get these things fixed and to generate the documentation that would support that effort and that would have made a stronger case for you to make to the owners to fix the walls, maybe an overwhelming case, and, certainly, as I indicated, would have made it much less likely that this would have happened, but I do note the fact that you at least tried to get some of these repairs done.

The second thing that makes your case different from all the others is that you are not a wealthy person. At this point, you are a 61-year-old out-of-work engineer who worked for Freedom Industries. That can't help. But, frankly, the bigger problem is that being out of work at your age, in this state, at this time, when most of your experience is with the coal industry and allied industries, is a tough situation, and that's in addition to having some medical issues.

You don't have a large net worth, nearly as large a net

worth as any of the other defendants. You have some modest retirement savings, but it looks to me from your financial profile, like you are -- you have a negative monthly cash flow which probably has you eating into your retirement savings, so that makes you different from the other defendants in these cases to me, as well.

I know you have a college degree and you've had some pretty good engineering jobs at times, but it seems to me that your collar is a just little bit bluer. So, based on all of those considerations, it is the judgment of this Court that you be sentenced to 3 years of probation.

While on probation, you must not commit another federal, state or local crime; you must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance; and you must also comply with the standard terms and conditions of probation as recommended by the U. S. Sentencing Commission and as adopted by this Court, including the -- except that you need not participate in a program of testing, counseling and treatment for drug and alcohol abuse, as that does not appear to be implicated in your case.

You must also abide by the special conditions of probation as set forth in the local rules of this Court.

I am going to impose a fine of \$2,500.00, which is the statutory minimum. In connection with that, I will add the following special conditions of probation:

That you shall be required to provide the Probation Office

1 access to any requested financial information; and that you shall 2 pay all monies received from income tax refunds, lottery 3 winnings, judgments, and any other anticipated or unanticipated 4 financial gains to the fine obligation. I will make that fine due immediately, but we can talk in a 5 6 moment about whether or not we need to put that on a schedule. 7 I'm not going to impose interest on the fine. And I note that 8 you've already paid the special assessment, so you may be seated. 9 Ms. Robinson, does the defendant wish a payment schedule for 10 the fine or does he want to make a lump sum payment? 11 MS. ROBINSON: He would like to have a payment schedule 12 for the fine, Your Honor, and I would also ask the Court consider dispensing with the term of probation that would require him to 13 have drug testing under the Court and --14 15 THE COURT: I did not impose that. 16 MS. ROBINSON: Okay. 17 THE COURT: Well, it's -- it is a mandatory condition 18 by local rule, but it's at the discretion of the probation 19 officer, and I assume that when I don't impose it as a 20 discretionary term, they know we don't need it in this case. 21 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: So, I'm not imposing drug testing. 23 What fine schedule, payment schedule, do you propose? 24 MS. ROBINSON: Your Honor, I think if you could impose \$75.00 a month; if, at some point he can pay it off earlier, then 25

he would -- under the three-year term of probation, he would do that, but with the \$75.00 a month, I believe by the end of the term of probation, he would be able to fully satisfy the entire amount of the fine.

THE COURT: Is there any objection to that?

MR. WRIGHT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, if there's no objection, I will allow the defendant -- I'll make it due immediately, but I will allow the defendant to pay -- make monthly payments of \$75.00 a month and that will be a condition of probation.

All right. Mr. Burdette, I note that there is a significant appeal waiver contained in your plea agreement. As qualified by that waiver, you have the right to appeal the judgment of this Court. Any Notice of Appeal must be filed with the Clerk not more than 14 days from the date of the entry of the judgment order.

If you desire counsel on appeal and you are not able to retain counsel, the appropriate Court will review a financial affidavit filed by you to determine whether or not to appoint counsel.

Do you understand your right to appeal and the 14-day filing requirement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will place the Presentence Report under seal subject to counsel's right to unseal as necessary for

```
1
        appeal.
 2
             Any other matters we need to take up in this case?
 3
                  MR. WRIGHT: No, Your Honor.
                  MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 4
 5
                  THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 6
             (Proceedings concluded at 3:18 p.m., February 4, 2016.)
 7
 8
        CERTIFICATION:
 9
             I, Ayme A. Cochran, Official Court Reporter, certify that
10
        the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of
11
        proceedings in the matter of United States of America, Plaintiff
12
        v. Michael E. Burdette, Defendant, Criminal Action No.
13
        2:14-cr-00276-1, as reported on February 4, 2016.
14
15
        s/Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR
                                                      April 5, 2016
16
        Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR
                                                           DATE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```